

The rejection of the claims over a single reference under Section 103 is maintained. A number of additional references are discussed in the response to arguments, but it is understood that none of these references are relied upon.


The gist of the argument, at this point, seems to be that because it is known to provide communications between different devices over a bus, it would be obvious to communicate the specific information claimed. But, of course, this begs the obviousness question. The invention is realizing the benefit of obtaining the specific information claimed, not in actually being able to cause information of any type to be communicated.

Since no reference of record in any way suggests providing power class information in particular, the single reference Section 103 rejection most certainly fails to make out a *prima facie* case. This must be because there is no reference that teaches any reason to modify the only cited reference to obtain power class information in particular.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 25, 2002



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]



APPENDIX

Please cancel claim 14.

Please amend claim 15 as follows:

15 (Amended). The article of claim [14] 11 further storing instructions that enable the processor-based system to receive a power class indication from the sink.

RECEIVED
OCT 31 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800